



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/593,742	06/14/2000	Venkata S. Ayyagari	06502.0301	9037

22852 7590 04/05/2004

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
1300 I STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, THANH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2144

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2004

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SL

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/593,742

Applicant(s)

Ayyagari et al.

Examiner

Tammy T Nguyen

Art Unit

2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE (3) MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION:

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6-8, 10-12 and 19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6-8, 10-12 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

Detailed Office Action

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 24, 2004 has been entered.
2. Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-12, and 19 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made

4. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10, 11, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crosskey et al., (hereinafter Crosskey) U.S. Patent No. 6,035,281 and Huang et al., (hereinafter Huang) U.S. Patent No. 6,292,835 in view of Shen et al., (hereinafter Shen) U.S. Patent No. 6,401,059.
5. As to claim 1, Crosskey teaches the invention as claimed, including method for

Art Unit: 2143

processing content requests in a network having at least one content provider having stored documents in an unprocessed format, a proxy server and at least one client, the method comprising the following steps performed by the proxy server, of: receiving a request from the client for a document associated with the content provider (Fig.1, content provider 4 and client computer 1, and col.5, lines 1-10) determining whether a processed version of the document is located in a local cache (col.5, lines 10-25); when it is determined that the processed version of the document is located in the local cache, providing the processed version of the document to the client (col.5, lines 10-34); and when it is determined that the processed version of the document is not located in the local cache, Crosskey does not teach the (i) obtaining the unprocessed document associated with the content provider; (ii) processing the unprocessed document in accordance with predetermined instructions associated with the unprocessed document; and (iii) providing the processed version of the identified processed document to the client. However, Huang teaches the obtaining the unprocessed document associated with the content provider; (ii) processing the unprocessed document in accordance with predetermined instructions associated with the unprocessed document; and (iii) providing the processed version of the identified processed document to the client (col.4, lines 2-45, and col.5, lines 10-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Crosskey and Huang to have processed version of the identified processed document to the client includes in a communication system because it would useful to have a series of actions, changes, or functions bringing about a result. Neither Crosskey nor Huang teach determining whether the document is an unprocessed extensible markup language (XML) document, and determined that the document is an unprocessed XML document. However, Shen

disclose determining whether the document is an unprocessed extensible markup language (XML) document, and determined that the document is an unprocessed XML document (col.3, lines 56-65, and col.4, lines 5-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Crosskey, Huang and Shen to have determining the document is an unprocessed XML document because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions to settle or decide (a dispute, question, etc.) by an authoritative or conclusive decision.

6. As to claim 2, Crosskey teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the step of processing the unprocessed document, further comprises the step of storing the processed version of the document in the local cache (col.5, lines 10-25).

7. As to claim 3, Crosskey and Huang do not teach the invention as claimed, wherein the predetermined instructions associated with the unprocessed document are store in a stylesheet associated with the content provider (col.4, lines 58-67)

8. As to claim 6, Crosskey teaches the invention as claimed, including method for processing content requests in a network having at least one content provider having stored documents in an unprocessed format, a proxy server (Fig.1, OLSP Proxy server) and at least one client (client computer 1), the method comprising the following steps performed by the proxy server, of: receiving an unprocessed document from the content provider (Fig.1, content provider 4, 10), wherein the document was requested by the client (Fig.1, client computer 1, and col.5, lines 1-10); determining whether a processed version of the document is located in a local cache (col.6, lines 50-64); when it is determined that the processed version of the document is located in the local cache (col.6, lines 1-34), providing the processed version of the document to the

Art Unit: 2143

client (col.5, lines 25-35); and when it is determined that the processed version of the document is not located in the local cache, Crosskey does not teach (i) processing the unprocessed document in accordance with predetermined instructions associated with the unprocessed document; and (ii) providing the processed version of the identified processed document to the client. However, Huang teaches the processing the unprocessed document in accordance with predetermined instructions associated with the unprocessed document; and (ii) providing the processed version of the identified processed document to the client (col.4, lines 2-45, and col.5, lines 10-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Crosskey and Huang to have processed version of the identified processed document to the client includes in a communication system because it would useful to have a series of actions, changes, or functions bringing about a result. Neither Crosskey nor Huang teach determining whether the document is an unprocessed extensible markup language (XML) document, and determined that the document is an unprocessed XML document. However, Shen disclose determining whether the document is an unprocessed extensible markup language (XML) document, and determined that the document is an unprocessed XML document (col.3, lines 56-65, and col.4, lines 5-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Crosskey, Huang and Shen to have determining the document is an unprocessed XML document because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions to settle or decide (a dispute, question, etc.) by an authoritative or conclusive decision.

9. As to claim 7, Crosskey teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the step of

Art Unit: 2143

processing the unprocessed document, further comprises the step of storing the processed version of the document in the local cache (Fig.1, client computer 1, and col.5, lines 10-25).

10. As to claim 8, Crosskey and Huang do not teach the invention as claimed, wherein the predetermined instructions associated with the unprocessed document are store in a stylesheet associated with the content provider (col.4, lines 58-67)

11. As to claim 10, Crosskey teaches the invention as claimed, including an Internet Proxy server comprising: a memory having program instructions (Fig.1, OLSP Proxy server); and a processor configured to use the program instructions to receive a request from a client for a document associated with the content provider (Fig.1, content provider.4, 10 and client computer 1, and col.5, lines 1-10); to determine whether a processed version of the document is located in a local cache (col.6, lines 1-34); when it is determined that the processed version of the document is located in the local cache, to provide the processed version of the document to the client (col.5, lines 1-25). Crosskey does not teach it is determined that the processed version of the document is not located in the local cache, (i) obtain the unprocessed document associated with the content provider; (ii) process the unprocessed document in accordance with predetermined instructions associated with the unprocessed document; and (iii) provide the processed version of the identified processed document to the client. However, Huang teaches the processed version of the document is not located in the local cache, (i) obtain the unprocessed document associated with the content provider; (ii) process the unprocessed document in accordance with predetermined instructions associated with the unprocessed document; and (iii) provide the processed version of the identified processed document to the client (col.4, lines 2-45, and col.5, lines 10-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

Art Unit: 2143

skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Crosskey and Huang to have processed version of the identified processed document to the client includes in a communication system because it would useful to have a series of actions, changes, or functions bringing about a result. Neither Crosskey nor Huang teach determining whether the document is an unprocessed extensible markup language (XML) document, and determined that the document is an unprocessed XML document. However, Shen disclose determining whether the document is an unprocessed extensible markup language (XML) document, and determined that the document is an unprocessed XML document (col.3, lines 56-65, and col.4, lines 5-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Crosskey, Huang and Shen to have determining the document is an unprocessed XML document because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions to settle or decide (a dispute, question, etc.) by an authoritative or conclusive decision.

12. As to claim 11, Crosskey teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the instruction to process the unprocessed document, further comprises the step of storing the processed version of the document in the local cache (col.5, lines 10-25).

13. As to claim 12, Crosskey and Huang do not teach the invention as claimed, wherein the predetermined instructions associated with the unprocessed document are store in a stylesheet associated with the content provider (col.4, lines 58-67)

14. As to claim 19, Crosskey teaches the invention as claimed, including a data processing system for processing content requests in a network having at least one content provider having stored documents in an unprocessed format, a proxy server and at least one client, the system comprising: means for receiving a request from the client for a document

Art Unit: 2143

associated with the content provider (Fig.1, content provider.4, 10 and client computer 1, and col.5, lines 1-10); means for determining whether a processed version of the document is located in a local cache (col.6, lines 1-34); means for providing the processed version of the document to the client when it is determined that the processed version of the document is located in the local cache (col.5, lines 1-25); Crosskey does not teach (i) means for obtaining the unprocessed document associated with the content provider when the processed version of the document is not located in the local cache, (ii) means for processing the unprocessed document in accordance with predetermined instructions associated with the unprocessed document when it is determined that the processed version of the document is not located in the local cache; and (iii) means for providing the processed version of the identified processed document to the client when it is determined that the processed version of the document is not located in the local cache.

However, Huang teaches (i) means for obtaining the unprocessed document associated with the content provider when the processed version of the document is not located in the local cache, (ii) means for processing the unprocessed document in accordance with predetermined instructions associated with the unprocessed document when it is determined that the processed version of the document is not located in the local cache; and (iii) means for providing the processed version of the identified processed document to the client when it is determined that the processed version of the document is not located in the local cache (col.4, lines 3 to lines 44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Crosskey and Huang to have processed version of the identified processed document to the client includes in a communication system because it would useful to have a series of actions, changes, or functions bringing about a result. Neither

Art Unit: 2143

Crosskey nor Huang teach determining whether the document is an unprocessed extensible markup language (XML) document, and determined that the document is an unprocessed XML document. However, Shen disclose determining whether the document is an unprocessed extensible markup language (XML) document, and determined that the document is an unprocessed XML document (col.3, lines 56-65, and col.4, lines 5-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Crosskey, Huang and Shen to have determining the document is an unprocessed XML document because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions to settle or decide (a dispute, question, etc.) by an authoritative or conclusive decision..


Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

16. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Tammy T. Nguyen** who may be reached via telephone at **(703) 305-7982**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. eastern standard time.

If you need to send the Examiner, a facsimile transmission regarding this instant application, please send it to **(703) 872-9306**. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, **David Wiley**, may be reached at **(703) 308-5221**.

TTN
March 31, 2004


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100